

ATTACHMENT A REMARKS

Considering the matters raised in the Office Action in the same order as raised, withdrawal of the restriction requirement is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-13, 15, 17-19 and 30 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being "anticipated by" the previously cited Gettemy reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Turning first to claim 1, it is agreed that "Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, detecting when the battery falls below a certain predefined threshold" and that "Gettemy teachings, in column 2, lines 15-25, providing a message that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life." However, while it is also agreed that a message is provided on the display screen which "allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life," it is respectfully submitted that this message does not provide a solution to correct the underlying fault. The solution would be, e.g., to change the battery or provide charging thereof, while merely changing the display simply prolongs the problem of having a weak battery. While the position of the Examiner with respect to this particular point is understandable, it is respectfully submitted that, on the other hand, the second difference pointed out in the previous response is simply not taught by Gettemy.

Considering the latter point in more detail, the Examiner has previously referred to lines 15-36 of column 2 and stated that "if the user however doesn't choose to take this solution the device can automatically make the change for the user if it reaches a lower critical level (see column 7, lines 38-47), further Gettemy teaches, in column 9, lines 18-24, the system having an additional battery warning system that provides the user with a critically low battery warning (indicating that it is past the displayed change solution and it is now time to charge)." The Examiner makes a similar argument in the Response to Arguments section and, in particular, states that "Gettemy further teaches ... that if the display is already in the monochrome mode and the battery energy level still falls below the critical level, then a critically low battery warning is provided to the user (telling them they need to charge)." The Examiner concludes that the "Gettemy system provides the user with the initial solution that will hopefully prolong the battery

life long enough, but should it not suffice a further indication of the need to charge is provided."

It is respectfully submitted that these arguments are not well taken. First, with respect to the provision for the electronic device automatically changing to a low power display if the user has not yet made a low power selection when the battery level reaches a critical low level, this is clearly not the determination of a further solution. The "solution" provided is exactly the same as the previous "solution" (changing to a lower battery level) but is simply performed automatically. Moreover, there is clearly no provision in Gettemy of a further graphical depiction which illustrates the further solution.

With respect to the passage at column 9, it is first noted that the disclosure here is in the context of an introductory statement that "process 400 does not replace any other battery life warning processes that may also reside within device 100." Further, with respect to the statement on which the Examiner relies here, i.e., the statement that "if the device 100 is in monochrome display mode and the battery level of device 100 falls below the critical level, a critically low battery warning may be given to the user," it is respectfully submitted that this is not a disclosure of a further solution for correcting the fault condition. In this regard, a mere warning is not a solution and moreover, there is no disclosure in Gettemy that a further graphical depiction is provided which illustrates the further "solution." In addition, as indicated above, the disclosure here is that the warning is something different from, and apart from, the process 400 and something that occurs when the display is already in the monochrome display mode.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is simply no disclosure in Gettemy of determining a solution for correcting the fault condition wherein this determining step comprises first determining a highly probable solution for correcting the fault condition and providing a first graphical depiction which illustrates the highly probable solution and, if the highly probable solution does not correct the fault condition, determining a further solution for correcting the fault condition and providing a further graphical depiction which illustrates the further solution. In addition to the points discussed above, it is noted that the Gettemy system may be in the monochrome display mode throughout so that what the Examiner regards as the first "solution" may never be

displayed. Moreover, and more importantly, it is clear that switching to the monochrome display mode is simply a temporary fix and is not “a highly probable solution” for correcting the fault condition. In this regard, changing the batteries or charging the batteries is the highly probable solution for correcting the fault condition and even if the Examiner is correct in his position regarding the battery warning (and applicant strongly disagrees with this position as set forth above), the warning, to the extent that it suggests the “solution” to which the Examiner refers, i.e., changing or charging the batteries, and to the extent that this warning is not simply a mechanical buzzer or the like but rather is a graphical representation of the “solution” (something that is not disclosed by Gettemy), it is this “solution” that is the “highly probable solution” rather than the first “solution” of switching to a monochrome display mode. Thus, the sequence in Gettemy is clearly different from that claimed. In summary, for all the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably defines over the Gettemy reference.

Similar remarks apply to independent claim 13, which has been amended to include limitations similar to those of claim 1 and is thus patentable for similar reasons to those discussed previously.

It is noted that two new dependent claims have been added which depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, and which recite that the “highly probable solution” is capable of “completely eliminating the fault condition.” Thus, these claims make even more explicit the distinction discussed above with respect to the teachings of Gettemy.

Turning to claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that the Gettemy patent does not disclose the subject matter of this claim. In the Response to Arguments section, the Examiner has contended that “Gettemy teaches, In column 2, lines 15-25 and in figures 7-9, providing a message, on the display screen, that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life, the functions the user is capable of performing are to <place in monochrome display mode> or <maintain display in color mode>.” The Examiner states that this “provides the user, should the battery be detected to be low enough, with a help routine to place the display in a state that prolongs battery life.” It is respectfully submitted that these teachings are not a disclosure of the subject matter of claim 8.

Claim 8, as amended, recites providing a help routine wherein the help routine includes a list of functions an apparatus capable of performing in response to activation by a user, receiving from a user a selection of a particular function, and displaying a graphical depiction of at least one step for activating the particular function selected by the user on a display device of the apparatus. The functions are not functions that the user is capable of performing (as the Examiner states), and the message "maintain display in color mode" does not even appear to be a particular function to be performed but rather to simply be a passive action. More importantly, the Gettemy patent clearly does not display a graphical depiction of at least one step for activating the particular function (selected by the user) on a display device of the apparatus. In Gettemy, accepting the arguments presented by the Examiner, it is the "functions" that are displayed, not steps for activating a particular selected function. In this regard, the two "functions" to which the Examiner has referred cannot be both "functions" and "a graphical depiction of at least one step for activating said particular function" (selected by the user). Hence, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 3, 6, 16, 20, 21, 23-27 and 29 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being "unpatentable over Gettemy and Kim." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the lines of the Kim patent to which reference has been made in the Office Action, Kim provides for displaying a pictorial image on a screen "in either the state the input video signal has been disabled or the state where the video signal has been connected from an external computer system." It is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching in the Kim patent of providing a pictorial depiction of a solution to correcting these problems. This is evident from the lines cited in the Office Action as well as the "display exhibits" shown on the screens depicted in Figures 3A-3C. In this regard, Figure 3A shows a display which is designed "to illustrate, collectively or separately, the chromaticity and entirety of each video component colors red R, green G and blue B" while Figure 3B shows "a display of a cross-hatched type designed for adjustment of a preset video mode" wherein "such parameters as convergence or linearity characteristics of a CRT are provided, such that information about the CRT regarding this mode can be identified by the viewer" and in Figure 3C "a plurality of messages required for an initial setting up of a video display screen are displayed in a sequential

manner.” In the latter case, Kim provides that these messages can include “a message representing no connection between cable connector and a cable of external system” but, clearly, no solution is displayed.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Examiner states that certain passages of the Kim patent teach “ a video display capable of self diagnosis, wherein several pictorial representations are displayed on the screen to show the user whether the monitor is connected or disconnected so as to show the user the cause of the lack of picture.” As indicated above, Kim, at best, discloses that the messages provided include “a message representing no connection between cable connector and a table of external system” but clearly does not provide for any display of a solution.

With respect to independent claims 20 and 26, claim 20 recites, inter alia, “means for displaying on the display a pictographical solution for providing a proper connection with said connector in the event that said detecting means detects that a proper connection is not made with said connector” while claim 26 recites “means for displaying on the display an iconographical depiction for providing a user with a solution with which the user can cause a proper connection to be made with said connector.” In rejecting claim 20, for example, the Examiner acknowledges that Gettemy does not teach “the determined fault being of whether a connection is made with a connector and displaying a pictorial solution providing should it be detected that a proper connection is not made.” This statement of what is claimed in claim 20 may simply involve an inadvertent omission but it is important to note that the recitation in question in claim 20 refers to providing a solution with which the user can cause a proper connection to be made, something that simply is not disclosed by either Gettemy or Kim.

With respect to the rejection of claim 22 and the rejection of claim 4 which rely on the Petty patent, while Petty discloses an apparatus wherein a plurality of status icons is selected and subsequently displayed for a predetermined time period, there is simply no teaching in Petty with respect to providing a graphical display for correcting a fault condition. Thus, claims 4 and 22 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of the claims parent thereto.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Gettemy, Kim and Friesen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Friesen patent merely discloses a microcomputer system with color coded components. This teaching is characterized in the Office Action as being of "color-coded cables being plugged into color-coded ports." It is respectfully submitted that there mere fact that "color-coded cables have been plugged into color-coded ports" in the prior art (something that Applicant freely admits) is not teaching of the subject matter of claim 7, i.e., there is no teaching in any of the references which would lead to providing a graphical depiction of a color-coded monitor cable being plugged into a color-coded connector, as claimed in claim 7. Given the actual teachings of Friesen and the other references the rejection here is clearly the improper product of hindsight. Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable for this reason as well as the reasons set forth above in support of parent claim 1.

With respect to the Response to Arguments section regarding claim 7, applicants respectfully disagree with the proposed combination, and note that the teachings of the Friesen patent have nothing to do with those of Kim much less Gettemy. Thus, again, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination is necessarily the improper product of hindsight.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS